UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,629	12/17/2003	Avery Fong	246161US2CONT	4751

22850 7590 07/09/2008

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
TSUI, WILSON W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/09/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/736,629	FONG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WILSON TSUI	2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-35* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This final action is in response to the after final filed on: 04/22/08, and amendment filed on 11/05/07.

2. Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, and 22 are amended. Claims 1-35 are pending. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are independent claims.

3. The amendments to the claims in the after final amendment (04/22/08) are *not* entered (for reasons explained in the advisory action sent on: 05/21/08).

4. The previous office action (Final Rejection sent on: 01/29/08) is vacated, to properly address claims 31 - 35; as disclosed below in this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

With regards to claim 34, the claim cites that limitation "transforming … first structured format … directly into the second structured format … without using a third structured format". The applicant cites support for this in Figs. 18A-1 to 18C-3.

However, the examiner respectfully points out that in Fig. 18A-2: a symbol table is used as a third structured format to aid in the transformation process. Thus, the claimed limitation in claim 34, appears to contradict, Fig 18A-2, since a third structured format (a symbol table) is used to perform the transformation; in view of the claim language citing "… without using a third structured format". The examiner respectfully asks where specifically in the specification is it enabled that a third format is not used, when as shown in Fig 18-2, a Symbol table (a table having data structure) is used to perform a transformation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-15, 17-19, 21-23, and 25-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rada et al ("Hypertext Interchange Using ICA", published: June 1995, pages 99-117), in further view of Linden2 ("Alchemist: A General Purpose Transformation Generator", pages i-iv, and 1-37).

With regards to claim 1, Rada et al teaches a method of transforming information, comprising:

- *Inputting, into an editor, a first structural description of a first structured format*: (page 100: whereas, the original data representation/first-structural-description is specified)
- *Inputting, into the editor, a second structural description of a second structured format; inputting, into the editor by a user, preferences for transforming an element of the first structural description to at least one element of the second structural description* (pages 100 and 101: whereas, the intermediate format/second-structural description is also specified, and preferences for transforming an element of the first structural description to at least one element of the second structural description are also entered using the recoding and structural mapping toolset);
- *Storing translation information output from the editor, the translation information comprising at least the preferences input by the user* (page 101: whereas, the translation information is stored in a recoded file);
- *transforming a first document or database structure provided in the first structured format into a second document or database structure in the second structured format based on the translation information* (Figure 1, page 101: whereas, using the recoded file/document, the first structured format/specific/original data representation is converted to the second/general/intermediate/document structure representation using the Specific to General tool.

However, although Rada teaches an *editor*, Rada does not expressly teach a *map* editor *with a graphical user interface*.

Yet, Linden2 teaches the *map editor with a graphical user interface* (Fig 2, page 5: whereas a map editor is displayed/used via graphical user interface such that the user inputs/assigns mapping preferences).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rada's editor, such that the editor would have been a map editor with a graphical user interface, as taught by Linden2. The combination would have allowed Rada and Linden to have "offered an appealing alternative to writing individual transformation code each time a new transformation is needed" (Linden2, page 2), and to have "provided user interfaces [for] transformation" (Linden2, page 1).

With regards to claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Rada teaches wherein *the transforming includes transforming the document and the first structured format has a Document Type Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy* (page 102: whereas, the first structured format, can be SGML (which includes a DTD), such that the second format will by a structural format for a hypertext system).

With regards to claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Rada teaches wherein *the transforming includes transforming the document and said first structured format is derived from Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)*, as similarly explained in

the rejection for claim 2, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 5, which depends on claim *3,* Rada teaches *wherein the second structured format is a Document Type Definition (DTD) directed hierarchy* (page 102: whereas, the second structured format, can be the open and interchange layer, and the first structured format can be the text markup language, such that the second structured format is SGML (which includes a DTD)).

With regards to claim 6, which depends on claim 3, Rada teaches further comprising: *outputting, from the editor to a graphical user interface, a representation of a translation between the first structured format and the second structured format* (page 114: whereas, a representation of a translation (translation from 'MUCH' to 'Guide') is shown/presented on a computer screen).

With regards to claim 7, which depends on claim 3, Rada teaches wherein *the second structured format is derived from Standard Generalized Markup Language (SGML)*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 5, and is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 10, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 11, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 3, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 13. which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 5, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 14. which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 15, which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 7, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 1, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 18, which depends on claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 2, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 17, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 3, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 5, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 6, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 23, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 7, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 25, which depends on claim 1, Rada teaches *wherein the preferences for transforming*, as similarly explained by the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale. However, Rada does not expressly teach the preferences for transforming *include a user selection of which elements of the first structured format to map to the second structured format*.

Yet, the combination of Rada and Linden2 teaches the preferences for transforming *include a user selection of which elements of the first structured format to map to the second structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1 (whereas, the map editor is used, and also the map editor further allows the user to select elements of a first/source format to map to a second/target format through the use of a graphical tool, such as also shown in the mapper tool of Figure 2, page 5).

With regards to claim 26, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method performed in claim 25, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 27, which depends on claim 17, for a computer readable medium encoded with instructions which perform a method similar to the method performed in claim 27, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 28, which depends on claim 1, Rada teaches *generating translation information based on database design information, document type and a document* (page 101: whereas, "more than one set of data translators are generated … to form a converter from one markup language to another". Additionally, the generation of translation information is based upon database design information (page 100: whereas, specified through a grammar developer), document type and a document (page 100: whereas, original presentation/document type is detected, and the markup data in the original presentation is used.)

With regards to claim 29, which depends on claim 9, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 28, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 30, which depends on claim 17, for a computer-readable medium encoded with instructions, which perform a method similar to the method of claim 28, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 31, which depends on claim 1, Rada and Linden2 teaches *displaying the graphical user interface*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale. Additionally, Linden2 further explains the graphical user interface *includes a first area that displays a list of tags of the first structured format* (page 5, figure 2: a first area is shown in the source grammar window)*, a second area that displays a tag of the second structured format that a selected tag from the first area maps to* (page 5, figure 2: a second area is shown in the target grammar window)*; and creating a mapping between the first structured format and the second structured format based on contents of the first and second areas* (page 5, figure 2: whereas the mapper tool (third area) is used to define a mapping, and the spell tool is used to compile/generate the mapping). The third area *that displays a list of legal tags which can follow a last tag in the second area* (page A-4: whereas, the third area is used to define and display a list of legal tags through syntax and semantics of

the spell. The spell used to allow certain tags to follow a last tag based on order of structure data for output/transformation).

With regards to claim 32, which depends on claim 1, the combination of Rada and Linden2 teach *editing, with the graphical user interface, an existing map that transforms the first document or database structure provided in the first structured format into the second document or database structure in the second structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 31 (through the use of the mapper tool and spell tool), and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 33, which depends on claim 1, the combination of Rada and Linden2 teach *creating, with the graphical user interface, a map that transforms the first document or database structure provided in the first structured format into the second document or database structure in the second structured format* (through the use of the mapper tool and spell tool), as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 31, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 34, which depends on claim 1, the combination of Rada and Linden2 teach *transforming the first document or database structure provided in the first structured format directly into the second document or database structure in the second structured format based on the translation information without using a third*

structured format (through the use of the mapper tool and spell tool), as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 31, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 35, which depends on claim 1, the combination of Rada and Linden2 teach *breaking down a structure of the first document or database structure into source components and structure based on the first structured format;*

Presenting the source components and structure to the user through the graphical user interface of the map editor; Interactively selecting, by the user through the graphical user interface, components of the first structured format with candidate target components of the second structured format; and interactively selecting, by the user through the graphical user interface, target components of the candidate target components for a mapping of the source components for creation of a rule for a transformation map (page 5: whereas, a structure is broken down and the source components of the first structured format are presented in the mapper tool editor for selection by the user , desired candidate target components of a second structured format; such that a rule is created for a transformation.)

7. Claims 4, 8, 12, 16, 20, and 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rada et al ("Hypertext Interchange Using ICA", published: June 1995, pages 99-117), in view of Linden2 ("Alchemist: A General Purpose Transformation Generator", pages i-iv, and 1-37); and further in view of Burnard ("SGML on the Web: too little too soon, or too much too late?", published: November 1, pages 1-9).

With regards to claim 4, which depends on claim 3, RADA teaches *wherein the transforming includes transforming the document and said first structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Rada does not expressly teach the first structured format is *eXstensible Markup Language (XML)*.

Burnard teaches a structured format is *eXstensible Markup Language (XML)*: whereas, "XML is used as a leaner and simpler subset of the SGML metalanguage" (p8-1)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rada's first structured format to have been the structured format of XML, as taught by Burnard. The combination of Rada, Linden, and Burnard would have allowed Rada to have "been able to support a wide variety of applications, and with a concise formal design" (Rada, p8-1).

With regards to claim 8, which depends on claim 7, RADA teaches *said second structured format*, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale. However, Rada does not expressly teach the second structured format is *eXstensible Markup Language (XML)*.

Burnard teaches a structured format is *eXstensible Markup Language (XML)*: whereas, "XML is used as a leaner and simpler subset of the SGML metalanguage" (p8-1)

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Rada's second structured format to have been the structured

format of XML, as taught by Burnard. The combination of Rada, Linden2, and Burnard would have allowed Rada to have "been able to support a wide variety of applications, and with a concise formal design" (Rada, p8-1).

With regards to claim 12, which depends on claim 11, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 4, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 16, which depends on claim 15, for a system performing a method similar to the method of claim 8, is rejected under the same rationale

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 19, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 4, is rejected under the same rationale.

With regards to claim 24, which depends on claim 23, for a computer program product performing a method similar to the method of claim 8, is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

9. With regards to claims 25-27, the applicant argues that the claims are rejected using a reference (Linden) that is not prior art. However, this argument is rendered

moot, since the applicant has amended their respective independent claims, from which they depend on, thus changing the scope of the applicant's invention. A new reference (Linden2), is been introduced to reject the corresponding independent claims 1, 9, and 17, as well as to reject the dependent claims 25-27 (of new scope). Thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive, and is respectfully directed to the rejections above for further explanation. Additionally, a letter from the author (Linden) confirms the publication date, to qualify the Linden reference as prior art. The letter will be mailed with this office action.

10. With regards to claim 1, the applicant argues the amended claim language further comprising a *map* editor *with a graphical user interface*. This argument is moot, since a new reference, Linden2, is used as necessitated by the applicant's amendment, and the applicant is respectfully directed to the above claim rejection for further explanation. Furthermore, the applicant argues that Rada does not disclose or suggest a graphical user interface plays any role in the translation process. However, as similarly explained above, a new reference, Linden2 is used to show that this particular limitation is taught when combined with Rada; thus, the applicant's argument is not persuasive.

11. With regards to claims 9 and 17 for being allowable since they include limitations similar to claim 1; is not persuasive since claim 1 has been shown/explained to be rejected, as similarly explained above.

12. With regards to claims 2-16, 25, and claims 28-35 that are dependent thereon upon claim 1, 9, or 17 is allowable; is not persuasive, since claims 1, 9, and 17 have been shown/explained to be rejected, as similarly explained above.

Conclusion

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILSON TSUI whose telephone number is (571)272-7596. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

/Wilson Tsui/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
July 02, 2008